

## REMARKS

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,714,797 to Rautila (*"Rautila"*).

Applicant proposes to amend claims 6 and 10. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 6-13 would remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rautila*.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a method comprising, "obtaining an identification code . . . for identifying the electronic content item, wherein the identification code corresponds only to the electronic content item." *Rautila* does not disclose at least the obtaining step of claim 6.

*Rautila* discloses, "receiving through the mobile network a unique order number corresponding to the mobile device, the ordered digital product, and the identified hotspot network" (col. 9, lines 61-62). Even assuming that the "unique order number" of *Rautila* could correspond to the claimed "identification code," which the Applicant does not concede, "corresponding to the mobile device, the ordered digital product, and the identified hotspot network," as taught in *Rautila*, cannot constitute "correspond[ing] only to the electronic content item" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, claim 6, as amended, recites a method comprising, "enabling the customer to view physical commodities that are available for purchase, in addition to the electronic content items, at the store information terminal." *Rautila* does not disclose the enabling means of claim 6.

*Rautila* discloses, “user [ ] may browse the content titles available . . . user may select . . . a particular digital product desired and place a purchase order” (col. 6, lines 2-6). *Rautila* also discloses, “user [ ] may make further searches and purchases of digital products while located at hotspot network [ ] location . . . digital product which would ultimately be sold to user [ ] and downloaded into mobile station” (col. 5, lines 47-53). “[D]igital product which would ultimately be . . . downloaded into mobile station,” as taught in *Rautila*, cannot constitute “physical commodities,” as recited in claim 6.

Accordingly, *Rautila* cannot anticipate claim 6.

Claim 10, though of different scope than claim 6, is allowable over *Rautila*, for at least the same reasons as claim 6. Claims 7-9 and 11-13 depend from claims 6 and 10, respectively, and are thus allowable over *Rautila*, for at least the same reasons as claims 6 and 10.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment After Final, reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 17, 2007

By:   
Eli Mazour  
Reg. No. 59,318  
(202) 408-4320